Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-29 and 32-34 remain in the application. Claims 1-21 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 30 and 31 were previously cancelled.

In item 4 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action claims 22-24 and 29 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Funada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,229) (hereinafter "Funada"), which was incorrectly designated as 6,078,299 by the Examiner, under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 22 calls for, inter alia:

the carrier substrate and the capping substrate defining at least one cavity therebetween containing the at least one filter, and at least one interconnection for coupling the at least one filter to a wiring substrate using flip-chip technology, the interconnection being a solder or metal bump.

On page 3 of the Office action, the Examiner alleges that Funada discloses a carrier substrate (31) and a capping substrate (12). The Examiner also alleges that Funada discloses "at least one interconnection (15, 16) for coupling said at least one filter to a wiring substrate using flip chip technology. Wherein said at least one interconnection is a solder or metal bump (16)". It is respectfully noted that the Examiner's allegation is not correct. More specifically, Funada explicitly discloses that the bump (16) connects the piezoelectric substrate (11) (Examiner's "carrier substrate") to the circuit substrate (12) (Examiner's "capping substrate") (Fig. 6D). Funada does not disclose a wiring substrate. Accordingly, Funada does not disclose that the bump (16) connects a filter to a wiring substrate. Therefore, it is respectfully noted that the Examiner's allegation with respect to the interconnection, is not accurate.

The reference does not show the carrier substrate and the capping substrate defining at least one cavity therebetween

containing the at least one filter, and at least one interconnection for coupling the at least one filter to a wiring substrate using flip-chip technology, the interconnection being a solder or metal bump, as recited in claim 22 of the instant application. The Funada reference discloses a piezoelectric substrate and a circuit substrate connected by a bump. Funada does not disclose that a carrier substrate and a capping substrate are connected to a wiring substrate by an interconnection. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which the carrier substrate and the capping substrate define at least one cavity therebetween containing the at least one filter, and at least one interconnection couples the at least one filter to a wiring substrate using flip-chip technology, the interconnection is a solder or metal bump.

In the 6 on page 3 of the Office action, claims 25 and 26 have been rejected as being obvious over Funada (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,229) in view of Tanski (U.S. Patent No. 4,409,570) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Tanski does not make up for the deficiencies of Funada. Since claim 22 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 25 and 26 are believed to be allowable as well.

In the 7 on page 4 of the Office action, claims 27 and 28 have been rejected as being obvious over Funada (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,229) in view of Penunuri (U.S. Patent No. 5,287,036) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Penunuri does not make up for the deficiencies of Funada. Since claim 22 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 27 and 28 are believed to be allowable as well.

In item 10 on page 4 of the Office action, claims 32-34 have been rejected as being obvious over Funada (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,229) in view of Yamada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,932,950) (hereinafter "Yamada") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Yamada does not make up for the deficiencies of Funada. Since claim 22 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 32-34 are believed to be allowable as well.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 22. Claim 22 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 22, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-29 and 32-34 are solicited.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 2 0 2006

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of one month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$120 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully bobmitted,

For Applicant (s)

Alfred K. Dassler 52,794

AKD:cgm

November 20, 2006

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP Post Office Box 2480 Hollywood, FL 33022-2480

Tel: (954) 925-1100 Fax: (954) 925-1101